

Coherent versus sequential electron tunneling in quantum dots

L. E. F. Foa Torres,¹ C. H. Lewenkopf,² and H. M. Pastawski¹¹Facultad de Matemática, Astronomía y Física, Universidad Nacional de Córdoba,
Ciudad Universitaria, 5000 Córdoba, Argentina²Instituto de Física, Universidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro,
R. São Francisco Xavier 524, 20550-900 Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

Manifestations of quantum coherence in the electronic conductance through nearly closed quantum dots in the Coulomb blockade regime are addressed. We show that quantum coherent tunneling processes explain some puzzling statistical features of the conductance peak-heights observed in recent experiments at low temperatures. We employ the constant interaction model and the random matrix theory to model the quantum dot electronic interactions and its single-particle statistical fluctuations, taking full account of the finite decay width of the quantum dot levels.

PACS numbers: 73.21.La, 73.23.-b, 03.65.Yz

Recent experimental studies of electronic transport through nearly isolated quantum dots [1, 2] assess the importance of quantum coherence and the nature of dephasing mechanisms in finite interacting electronic systems. Of particular interest is the Coulomb blockade regime, where the thermal energy $k_B T$ is much smaller than the charging energy E_C necessary to add an electron to the quantum dot. In this regime the conductance depends primarily on the quantum properties of the dot, such as its resonance levels and the corresponding line widths due to the coupling between the dot and leads. Electrons are allowed to tunnel through the quantum dot whenever the charging energy is compensated by an external potential and the dot energy levels are in resonance with the chemical potential at the leads (small bias limit). The tunneling condition can be attained, for instance, by a tunable gate voltage V_g . In a typical experiment V_g is varied to obtain the conductance spectrum, a sequence of sharp (Coulomb blockade) peaks.

Sequential tunneling is the key hypothesis for the standard rate equations [3] used to explain the transmission spectrum of quantum dots in the Coulomb blockade regime [4, 5]. This probabilistic picture neglects non-resonant quantum virtual processes, under the assumption that the resonant decay widths are much smaller than both $k_B T$ and the energy separation between the quantum dot resonances ϵ , namely, $\epsilon \gg k_B T$ and $\epsilon \gg \Gamma$, a condition often met by experiments in nearly isolated quantum dots.

The early experimental data taken from ballistic chaotic quantum dots were successfully confronted with the sequential theory by using the random matrix theory (RMT) to model the dot statistical single-particle properties [4, 5]. More recently, the analysis of the measured conductance peak-heights in the Coulomb blockade regime [1, 2] show significant deviations from this theory [6, 7, 8], indicating that some physics is missing. The inclusion of inelastic scattering processes [9, 10, 11, 12], spin-orbit coupling [13], and exchange interaction [14, 15] into the sequential approach expand in interesting ways

the considered physical processes, adding new parameters to the description. Unfortunately, these studies achieved only a limited success in reconciling theory with experiment.

In this Letter we show that quantum coherence, so far overlooked, leads to important corrections to the sequential tunneling picture [16] and explains some of the puzzles pointed out by the conductance experiments [1, 2]. The importance of coherent processes is justified by noticing that while the sequential theory requires

$k_B T \ll \epsilon$; the experiments satisfy those conditions only in average, namely, $\epsilon < \epsilon_c$ and $\epsilon < k_B T$. Since both the decay width Γ and the resonance spacings ϵ fluctuate, conductance peaks where ϵ is larger than $k_B T$ and comparable to Γ are not exceptional. More importantly, the study of fully coherent transport, as opposed to the sequential tunneling limit, provides a better framework to understand the interplay between coherence and interactions.

We describe a quantum dot coupled to external leads by the Hamiltonian

$$\hat{H} = \hat{H}_{\text{dot}} + \hat{H}_{\text{leads}} + \hat{H}_{\text{coupling}}; \quad (1)$$

We write the chaotic quantum dot Hamiltonian \hat{H}_{dot} as

$$\hat{H}_{\text{dot}} = \sum_j (E_j - e V_g) d_j^\dagger d_j + \frac{e^2}{2C} \hat{N}^2 - \epsilon \hat{N}; \quad (2)$$

where d_j^\dagger creates an electron in the j th eigenstate with energy E_j of the closed dot, $\hat{N} = \sum_j d_j^\dagger d_j$ is the electron number operator in the dot, V_g is the electrostatic energy due to the external gate (as usual, V_g is the gate voltage and ϵ depends on the system specifics), and C is the effective dot capacitance. Equation (2) is the constant interaction model. In chaotic quantum dots ground state energy fluctuations due to interaction effects are very small in the large N limit [5]. We also do not account for spin and exchange interaction, which were recently addressed in the master equation framework by

Refs. [14, 15]. The electrons in the leads are treated as non-interacting, namely

$$\hat{H}_{\text{leads}} = \sum_{k; \alpha \in L, R} \epsilon_k c_{k; \alpha}^\dagger c_{k; \alpha}; \quad (3)$$

where $c_{k; \alpha}^\dagger$ creates an electron at the state of wave vector $k = (2m/\hbar)^{1/2} \hbar$ at channel α either in the left (L) or in the right (R) lead. The dot-lead coupling term is

$$\hat{H}_{\text{coupling}} = \sum_{k; \alpha \in L, R} \sum_j V_{(k; \alpha); j} c_{k; \alpha}^\dagger d_j + \text{h.c.}; \quad (4)$$

The magnitude of the coupling matrix elements $V_{(k; \alpha); j}$ determine through a Fermi golden rule [17] the electron decay width Γ , or the tunneling rate Γ in the master equation framework. For quantum dots in the Coulomb blockade regime \hbar is much smaller than the dot mean level spacing Δ .

The conductance through the quantum dot is expressed in terms of the interacting system retarded Green's function, $G_{ij}^R(t) = (i\hbar)^{-1} \langle d_i(t); d_j^\dagger(0) \rangle$. The evaluation of $G_{ij}^R(t)$ follows the treatment presented by Baltin and collaborators [18] and generalizes their result to cases where the condition $\Gamma \ll \Delta$ is not met.

The retarded Green's function is written as a sum over terms containing different (and fixed) number of electrons in the dot

$$G_{ij}^R(t) = \frac{i}{\hbar} \langle t | \sum_{N=0}^{\infty} P_N d_i(t); d_j^\dagger(0) | N \rangle; \quad (5)$$

where P_N is the thermal probability to find N electrons in the dot. This probability considers the full set of occupation numbers n_{ij} of the \hat{H}_{dot} eigenstates. Equation (5) can be formally solved by the method of equation of motion. In practice, the equations do not close unless we assume that the number of electrons in the dot does not fluctuate, which means that we replace \hat{N} by its expectation value N [19]. This simplification is entirely justified in the cases of interest, where $e^2/C \gg k_B T$.

The matrix representation of the retarded Green's function is then casted as

$$G^R = \sum_{N=0}^{\infty} P_N \left[\begin{array}{c} \hbar \\ \mathbf{I} \end{array} \right] \mathbf{H}_{\text{dot}}^{(N)} \mathbf{R}^{(N)} (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{R}^{(N)}) + \left[\begin{array}{c} \hbar \\ \mathbf{I} \end{array} \right] \mathbf{H}_{\text{dot}}^{(N-1)} \mathbf{R}^{(N)} \mathbf{1}_N; \quad (6)$$

where the quantum dot matrix elements are

$$\mathbf{H}_{\text{dot}}^{(N)} = (E_j - e V_g + U N) \delta_{ij}; \quad (7)$$

and U is the quantum dot charging energy, namely, $U = e^2/C$. In Eq. (6) we define $[n_N]_{ij} = \langle n_i n_j \rangle_N$ as the diagonal matrix whose entries are the canonical

occupation numbers of the (closed) dot eigenstates. The retarded self-energy matrix elements, due to the coupling to the leads, become

$$\mathbf{R}^{(N)}_{ij} = \sum_{k; \alpha \in L, R} \frac{V_{i; (k; \alpha)} V_{(k; \alpha); j}}{\epsilon_k + i0^+ - \epsilon_{k; \alpha}}; \quad (8)$$

The coupling matrix elements $V_{(k; \alpha); j}$ vary in the energy scale of ϵ_k and hence are practically constant in energy windows comprising several single-particle states. We neglect such variations to write

$$\mathbf{R}^{(N)} = \frac{i}{2} (\mathbf{\Gamma}_L + \mathbf{\Gamma}_R) \quad (9)$$

where $\mathbf{\Gamma}_{ij} = \sum_k V_{i; (k; \alpha)} V_{(k; \alpha); j} = (\mathbf{\Gamma} + i0^+ - \mathbf{\epsilon}_{k; \alpha})^{-1} \delta_{ij} = 2\Gamma_{ij}$. The energy dependence due to the principal value integral is also negligible in the Coulomb blockade regime, since there are no open transmitting channels.

The linear-response conductance is [17]

$$G = \frac{e^2}{h} g \quad \text{with} \quad g = \frac{\partial f}{\partial \epsilon} \mathbf{T}_{R; L}^{(N)}; \quad (10)$$

where f is the Fermi distribution function in the leads with chemical potential μ . $\mathbf{T}_{R; L}$ is the system transmittance that can be directly computed from the retarded Green's function

$$\mathbf{T}_{R; L}^{(N)} = \sum_{i, j} V_{i; (k; L)} G_{ij}^R V_{j; (k; R)}; \quad (11)$$

Equivalently, the above expression can also be casted in the well-known form $\mathbf{T}_{R; L} = \text{tr}(\mathbf{\Gamma}_R \mathbf{G}^R \mathbf{\Gamma}_L \mathbf{G}^A)$ [17].

To this point our approach is quite general. The only important approximation we make requires $e^2/C \gg k_B T$. Albeit restrictive, the approximation is compatible with the Coulomb blockade experiments we are interested in. Our approach is reduced to the sequential tunneling one [3] in the limit of $\Gamma \ll \Delta$ in $(k_B T; \Delta)$. The main improvement is that we naturally account for quantum virtual tunneling processes. Those are significant whenever $k_B T$ becomes comparable with Δ , a condition often met by experiments. Furthermore, both the single-particle level spacings Δ and the decay widths Γ fluctuate. Even if in average $\Gamma \ll \Delta$, situations where Γ is comparable to Δ are not infrequent. In these cases quantum corrections are important. When the condition $\Gamma \ll \Delta$ is always satisfied and not only in average, corrections to the conductance become indeed negligible. This was the limit analyzed in Ref. [18] for the phase lapse problem. Note also the contrast with the case of elastic cotunneling at the conductance valleys. There, the contribution of the off-resonant levels is of order Γ/U , whereas here their contribution is of order Γ/Δ .

We switch now to the statistical study of the dimensionless conductance peak heights g^{max} . This analysis

allows for a comparison between the results of our approach, experiments and the sequential tunneling theory. The statistical ansatz is to assume that the underlying electronic dynamics in the quantum dot is very complex and hence the fluctuation properties of its single-particle eigenenergies and eigenfunctions coincide with those of an ensemble of random matrices [4, 5]. Accordingly, the single-particle levels display universal fluctuations and their spacings λ follow the Wigner-Dyson distribution. Likewise, the decay widths Γ are Porter-Thomas distributed. The inputs of the statistical theory are the mean level spacing λ and the average decay width Γ . We consider the dot both in the absence of a magnetic field (orthogonal ensemble, $\beta = 1$) and in the presence of a magnetic field B that breaks the time-reversal-symmetry (unitary ensemble, $\beta = 2$). The latter is the relevant one for comparison with available experimental data.

The numerical implementation is straightforward, but costly since Eq. (6) requires matrix inversions for each realization. The canonical thermal quantities P_N and $\ln_i i_N$ are computed using the quadrature formula explained in Ref. [20], already used for quantum dots [7, 8]. For $k_B T < \text{good individual peak height accuracy}$ requires taking into account at least 30 levels around the resonant one. Between $5 \cdot 10^4$ and $1 \cdot 10^5$ realizations were used for the ensemble averaging. The charging energy U is taken to be 50 (the results are quite insensitive to U , provided $U > 0$).

The data of Ref. [1] show that at very low temperatures, $k_B T \ll \Gamma$, the conductance peak-height distribution does not follow the standard random matrix theory [6]. By accounting for quantum coherent tunneling we obtain a very nice agreement with the experimental distributions. This is illustrated in Fig. 1 for $B \neq 0$ ($\beta = 2$). In the inset we present our results for the distribution of g^{max} for $B = 0$ ($\beta = 1$). In Fig. 1 the dimensionless conductance peak heights g^{max} are scaled to unit mean. We show the peak heights distribution for $k_B T = 0.1$, $\hbar\Gamma = 0.1$ (solid line) and $\hbar\Gamma = 0.2$ (dashed line). The histogram corresponds to the experimental result of Ref. [1] available only for $B \neq 0$ ($\beta = 2$). Different dots have different $\hbar\Gamma$, a ratio that can be determined from the experimental g^{max} . $\hbar\Gamma = 0.1$ is representative of the analyzed experiments. We find that as the ratio $\hbar\Gamma$ is increased, the probability to obtain small conductances is suppressed in comparison with the standard sequential theory (dotted line). This can be understood as follows: If a given resonance has small tunneling rates, the contributions due to virtual processes through its neighbors will reduce the chance to obtain a very small peak. Thus, we expect $P(g^{\text{max}} = 0) = 0$.

In the early experiment by Chang et al. [22] special care was taken to discard from the statistical sample conductance peak-heights that did not fulfill $k_B T \ll \Gamma$. Hence, corrections due to the finite ratio $\hbar\Gamma$ are practically




FIG. 1: Peak height probability distribution $P(g^{\text{max}})$ for $k_B T = 0.1$ and $B \neq 0$ ($\beta = 2$). The same for $B = 0$ ($\beta = 1$) in the inset. Our theory for $\hbar\Gamma = 0.1$ (solid line) and 0.2 (dashed line) is compared with the standard sequential tunneling result (dotted line), and the experimental distribution (histogram) [1].

negligible. This might explain why a good agreement with the standard sequential theory was found there [22]. Note also that as $k_B T$ becomes comparable with $\hbar\Gamma$ the assessment of the quantum dot temperature through the widths of the Coulomb blockade peaks becomes unreliable, due to the non-negligible $\hbar\Gamma$.

The experimental results of Ref. [1] show another striking and unexplained discrepancy with respect to the standard rate equations. This is best quantified by the ratio between the standard deviation g^{max} and the mean conductance peak heights $\langle g^{\text{max}} \rangle$, namely

$$g = \frac{g^{\text{max}}}{\langle g^{\text{max}} \rangle} = \frac{\sigma_{g^{\text{max}}}^2}{\langle g^{\text{max}} \rangle^2} \frac{\langle g^{\text{max}} \rangle^2}{\langle g^{\text{max}} \rangle} : \quad (12)$$

In the experiments g is significantly smaller than predicted by the rate equations plus RMT. Recent works [9, 11, 12] discuss if such deviations can be attributed to inelastic processes [21]. Our approach explains the experimental findings in the low temperature regime $k_B T \ll \Gamma$, where inelastic processes are hard to justify. In Fig. 2 we show g for $B \neq 0$ ($\beta = 2$) as a function of the thermal energy for different values of $\hbar\Gamma$. The inset shows g for the case when $B = 0$ ($\beta = 1$). The standard sequential theory results [7] are illustrated by the dotted lines.

At low temperatures and as $\hbar\Gamma$ is increased, our g is significantly reduced with respect to the standard sequential theory prediction. For higher temperatures, $k_B T > 0.5$, we obtain larger g than the measured ones. Furthermore, as the temperature increases our g approaches the standard theory result. Similar behavior was also recently found by including the exchange term in \hat{H}_{dot} [14, 15]. However, at high temperatures we ex-




FIG. 2: Normalized peak heights distribution width $\delta g_{\text{max}} / \langle g_{\text{max}} \rangle$ for $B \neq 0$ (the $B = 0$ case is shown in the inset) as a function of $k_B T / \Delta$, for $\Gamma = 0.05; 0.1; 0.2$ (dashed-dot, solid and dashed lines respectively). Symbols correspond to the experimental results of Ref. [1] for different dots and the dotted lines to the standard sequential theory.

pect a reduction of the peak heights fluctuations due to inelasticity and decoherence.

The suppression of the weak localization peak was recently used to determine the dephasing time in open quantum dots [23, 24]. This inspired Folk et al. to experimentally investigate the change in the conductance peak-height upon breaking the time-reversal symmetry of the quantum dots by applying a magnetic field B , namely

$$= \frac{hg_{\text{max}}^{\text{ax}}|_{B \neq 0}}{hg_{\text{max}}^{\text{ax}}|_{B = 0}} : \quad (13)$$

At zero temperature the sequential tunneling theory gives a constant $\alpha = 1/4$. Inclusion of temperature corrections and spectral fluctuations give small changes, essentially keeping $\alpha \approx 1/4$ [1, 12]. In Fig. 3 we show α as a function of temperature for different values of Γ . Our simulations show that α is larger than $1/4$ at low temperatures and decreases with increasing $k_B T$. This behavior suggests that a finite ratio Γ enhances more effectively the conductance in the unitary case than in the orthogonal case. Since α is very sensitive to the ratio Γ , particular care must be exercised when comparing data corresponding to different quantum dots. As in the analysis of $\delta g_{\text{max}} / \langle g_{\text{max}} \rangle$ our results suggest that an additional physical process is needed to explain the experimental data for $k_B T > \Delta$.

In summary, we have investigated the effect of quantum coherent processes on the statistics of the conductance peak heights. We found that at very low temperatures this leads to significant corrections to the distribution of conductance peak heights obtained using the standard sequential theory. The relevant parameter for these corrections is $\Gamma = k_B T$. Our study also indicates that estimates of the inelastic scattering rates and the




FIG. 3: Normalized change in the average conductance α as a function of temperature for different Γ .

strength of the effective exchange interaction in quantum dots using the peak height distributions need to account for coherent tunneling in order to be quantitative.

L. Foa Torres and C. H. Lewenkopf thank the CBPF for the hospitality. This work was supported by Antorchas, Viteae, CONICET, SeCyT-UNC and CNPq.

-
- [1] S. R. Patel, et al. Phys. Rev. Lett. 81, 5900 (1998).
 - [2] J. A. Folk et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 87, 206802 (2001).
 - [3] C. W. J. Beenakker, Phys. Rev. B 44, 1646 (1991).
 - [4] Y. A. Ihassid, Rev. Mod. Phys. 72, 895 (2000).
 - [5] I. L. A. Leiner, P. W. Brouwer, and L. I. Glazman, Phys. Rep. 358, 309 (2002).
 - [6] R. A. Jalabert, A. D. Stone, and Y. A. Ihassid, Phys. Rev. Lett. 68, 3468 (1992).
 - [7] Y. A. Ihassid, M. G. Kokocdag, and A. D. Stone, Phys. Rev. B 58, 7524 (1998).
 - [8] R. O. Vallejos, C. H. Lewenkopf, and E. R. Mucciolo, Phys. Rev. B 60, 13682 (1999).
 - [9] C. W. J. Beenakker, H. Schomerus, and P. G. Silvestrov, Phys. Rev. B 64, 033307 (2001).
 - [10] E. Eisenberg, K. Held, and B. L. Altshuler, Phys. Rev. Lett. 88, 136801 (2002).
 - [11] K. Held, E. Eisenberg, and B. L. Altshuler, Phys. Rev. B 66, 033308 (2002).
 - [12] T. Rupp, Y. A. Ihassid, and S. Malhotra, Phys. Rev. B 65, 193304 (2002).
 - [13] K. Held, E. Eisenberg, and B. L. Altshuler, Phys. Rev. Lett. 90, 106802 (2003).
 - [14] G. Usaj and H. U. Baranger, cond-mat/0211649.
 - [15] Y. A. Ihassid and T. Rupp, cond-mat/0212126.
 - [16] An early discussion of the coherent vs. sequential pictures in resonant tunneling diodes can be found in T. Weiland and B. Vinter, Appl. Phys. Lett. 50, 1281 (1987); M. Jonson and A. G. Rinowaj, Appl. Phys. Lett. 51, 1729 (1987); S. Luryi, Superlatt. and Microstruct. 5, 375 (1989).
 - [17] H. M. Pastawski, Phys. Rev. B 46, 4053 (1992); Y. Meir and N. S. Wingreen, Phys. Rev. Lett. 68, 2512 (1992).

- [18] R. B. Altin, Y. Gefen, G. Hackenbroich, and H. A. Weidenmüller, *Eur. Phys. J. B* 10, 119 (1999).
- [19] Y. Meir, N. S. Wingreen, and P. A. Lee, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 66, 3048 (1991).
- [20] W. E. O'Connell et al, *Phys. Rev. C* 49, 1422 (1994).
- [21] As pointed out in [9], the word decoherence is often misused in association to inelastic processes not included in the sequential tunneling theory.
- [22] A. M. Chang et al, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 76, 1695 (1996).
- [23] A. G. Huibers, et al, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 81, 1917 (1998).
- [24] P. W. Brouwer and C. W. J. Beenakker, *Phys. Rev. B* 55, 4695 (1997); E. R. P. Alves and C. H. Lewenkopf, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 88 256805 (2002).